

REMARKS

In response to the January 12, 2006, Office Action, reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in light of the following. As correctly noted in the Office Action Summary, claims 12-43 are pending. No claim amendments have been made in this response. Thus, upon entry of the present Response, claims 12-43 are pending and await further consideration on the merits.

OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

I. U.S. Patent No. 6,167,386

Claims 12-16 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,386 (hereafter "*the '386 patent*") on the grounds set forth in paragraph 3 of the Official Action. The Examiner indicated in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that claims 12-16 [*sic*] would be allowed by filing a notice of Terminal Disclaimer.

Applicant traverses this rejection. But, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant submits herewith a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer in order to obviate the above-noted obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

II. U.S. Patent No. 5,794,219

Claims 17-30 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,219 (hereafter "*the '219 patent*") on the grounds set forth in paragraph 3 of the Official Action. The Examiner indicated in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that claims 17-30 would be allowed by filing a notice of Terminal Disclaimer.

Applicants traverse this rejection. But, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants submit herewith a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer in order to obviate the above-noted obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

III. U.S. Patent No. 6,023,686

Claims 31-43 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,686 (hereafter "*the '686 patent*") on the grounds set forth in paragraph 3 of the Official Action. The Examiner indicated in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that claims 31-43 would be allowed by filing a notice of Terminal Disclaimer.

Applicants traverse this rejection. But, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants submit herewith a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer in order to obviate the above-noted obviousness-type double patenting rejection.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that any issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted so that any such issues may be adequately addressed and prosecution of the instance application expedited.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than the fee associated with the Terminal Disclaimer as provided therein. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2228, under Order No. 014030.0118N3US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: March 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michele V. Frank
Registration No.: 37028
PATTON BOGGS LLP
8484 Westpark Drive, 9th Floor
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 744-8085
(703) 744-8001 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant